

G.R.S. IX-5]

Previous references

322-1681-3

468 08-1-16

31-13 01-16

171-05-12

171-05-13

Later references, 18816

784-08-1-16

108-18-1-16

Preserve

1921.

(Muzrai)

File No. 269-22

Serial Nos. 2

Enclosures 5861

322-1681-147

310-35-143

Muzrai 176-36

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 2

Part B for February 23

SUBJECT

Management of Sri Kasi Visweswara Swami temple
and its endowments in the Mahadevapur Ganga
village Srirangapatna Dist.

Wg. Comr. Comptroller. Super. Revenue Survey.

f(2)

No 2239-41 & 10-2-23.

Sanctions the recommendations from the Dyf
and requests him to take such further action as
may be necessary for the renovation
of proper maintenance of the temple in
future

Printed on the Multigraph.

10/11

1/2/23

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(Muzrai)

NOTES.

File No. 269-22

FILE HEADING.

Management of Sri Kasi Vishweswara Swami temple and its endowments in the Mahadevapura jaghir Village, Seringapatam Taluk.

From

The Muzrai Commissioned in Mysore.

Memo No. C 872

Dated

14. 12 22

Received

19-12-22

Diary No.

1323

Enclos

1 file

Spare Copies.

Serial No.

/

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER.

Submits the Dy. Commr's communication reporting on the applications from Seidan and Lakshminandan raja Urs and Mr. Balaji Rao of Mysore praying that the temple management may be entrusted to them.

NOTES AND ORDERS.

Muz. collections bearing on the subject are herewith submitted.

2. Sri Kasi Vishweswara Swami Temple in Mahadevapura jaghir Village, Seringapatam Taluk, is a Muzrai institution.

G. R. S. III-2,

General and Revenue
Secretariat.

Muz File No. 263 of 1922

Serial
No.

endowed with 8 kithis in the village, yielding an annual income of Rs 1087/-. It is reported that the temple is now in a state of disrepair and has a desolate appearance.

The 3rd Mahanaja-kumari has purchased, ^{in Decr. 1915} from Mr H. Krishna Rao, pensioned Regimentary, the jagahis, Mahadrapur and its other villages, and Suddar ~~and~~ Lakshminarayana, who holds a General Power requests that the management of the said temple and its endowments be made over to him.

Mr M. Balaji Rao Son of Mr Rama Rao, late jagahirdar of Mahadrapur contends that the temple and its endowments are the private personal properties of his ancestors and prays that the management may be entrusted to him.

Both the petitions were forwarded to the Dep. Commr and that officer has submitted a full report dealing with the several aspects of the question.

G. R. S. III-2,

General and Revenue
Secretariat.

Imuz File No. 264

of 19

22

Serial
No.

That Sirdar Mr. Lakshmi Kantaraj
to whom the Village belongs is
much more likely to bring it
into a good condition than Belaji
Rao who has no further interest
in the Village, and states that
he would certainly hand over
the management to the Sirdar.

The Imuz. Comr agrees with
the recommendation of the
Dy. Comr.

5) Before deciding the question as
to whom the management of the
temple should be entrusted, it
is desirable to know what the
Imuz Comr will propose for
the renovation of the temple
building, whether the temple
has any saving which may
be utilized for the purpose,
and whether there exists any
scale of income and expenditure.
The temple is a major Imuz
instr.

6) Submitted for order of S. as to whether
the recommendation

By Imuz Comr
corrected in by

Muz File No. 269 of 1922

Serial
No.

The Murran Com^r may be
sanctioned the subject of the renovation
of the temple, fixing the scale of income
to be paid in the institutions &c one
for the Murran Com^r to decide. He may
be requested to take the needed action.

Rg

24/12/22

He there, any
orders, justifying the handing
over of the management of Muzra
institutions to private agency
Ug 24/12/22

av
24/12/22

87 No orders on the subject are available
Submitted

Av

22.12.22

26/12/22

of these put up pre-
cedents if any 26/12/22

av
26/12/22

(Flag 24)

From G.O. no 5431-Muz 789 C. 1.
of 12th June 1918 in Muz 4502 C. 20
11 of 1914-15, & is referred to
management of the institutions.
Swami temple at Kolakere in the
Jorihahalli Taluk, and the main land.

G. R. S. III-2,

General and Revenue
Secretariat.

Muz File No. 169 of 1922

Serial
No.

Pg. 14.

attached thereto, was restored to Sri Pullige Math.

"From the Dy. Commr. letter no. 330 of 11th July 1916 in Muz. F. No 308-15, it is seen that the khate of the income land endowment to Sri Gangadharaswami Swami Temple at Bhinmakatte, Puthahalli Taluk, is in the name of Sri Munivinda Math at Bhinmakatte which is managing the affairs of the Temple.

Muz. F. No. 26-18 relating to Sivasamudram Temple has been transferred to Muz. Commr. as well as Bidagiri Ranganatha Swami Temple relating to Belandur, Agre.

Submitted for orders

ms - 5.1.23. 84
5/1/23

The recommendation of the Muz Commr may be approved.
(For Member)

5-85-1-535-

19.1.23

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

Approved. The S^r has, in his letter of 29.11.22, given good reasons in support of the

1297
b
Mwv File No. 269 of 1922Serial
No.

have taken, & the recommendations made,
by him. It is for the M.C. to take
such further action as is necessary
for the renovation & proper maintenance
of the temple in future.

AV
24/1/23

Recd
24.1.23

24/21/23

Draft. S.O. Submitted

(M)
25.2.23
29.1.23

Fori Member

25/3/23

6235-920
30.1.23

Don't approved

Recd
27.1.23

27/3/23

2

M. 2289-4/2 10/1-3 to the
Hon. Commr., Comptroller, & Dir. of Rev. in
Sanctions the recommendations
of the D.C. and requests him to take
such further action as may be
necessary for the renovation and
proper maintenance of the temple
in future

1323
22-23 1922
From

the Deputy Commissioner,
Mysore District.

To

The Rev. Secretary to Govt.,
Bangalore.
Through the Muzrai Commissioner,
Mysore, Bangalore.

Dated Camp Koppa, 20th Novr. 1922

Despatched 24.11.22

Received

General No.

No.

Enclosure No.

Handwritten notes:
H. C. ...
...
...

269-22-1

25315

18 DEC 22

C 872 of 22-23
18.12.22

Forwarded, with compliments, to the
Rev. Secretary to Government.

I agree with the recommendation
of the Dy. Commr.

12/12/22

Submits a report in the
matter of management of Sri
Kasivisvesswara Swami Temple
and its encowments in the
Kandavagur Jagalur village,
Seringapatam Taluk.

YSORE DISTRICT

Dated, ^{amp Koppa,} Mysore, 20th November 192

From

P.F. Bowring, Esq
Deputy Commissioner, Mysore District

To

T. E. Jayarama Iyer, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
*Secretary to the Government of His Highness
the Maharaja of Mysore, Bangalore.
Revenue Department.*

THROUGH The Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore, Bangalore?
SIR,

With reference to your letter no. 1606/Muz.522-16-3 dated 2nd January 1917 and subsequent reminders thereto calling for a report on the applications from Sirdar M.

B_a ✓ Lakshmikantharaj Urs and Mr. Balaji Rao of Mysore request-
ing that the management of Sri Kasivisweswara Swami Temple
and its ²endowments in the mahādevpur jaghar village,
Seringapatam Taluk may be handed over to them etc.,
I have the honor to state, as follows:-

The Jaghir village of Mahadevapur in Seringapatam Taluk originally belonged to one Bakshi Rama Rao (deceased). It is said that it was granted to him in 1818 by the then Maharaja of Mysore for the military services rendered by him to the State. Bakshi Rama Rao is reported to have established an Agrahar of Bramhins, built a temple therein and divided the lands granted to him into Vrittis, and allotted them to the Agrahar Brahmins and to the Temple reserving a few vrittis for himself as Yejman or De'adman. As Rama Rao, a descendant of the original grantee, Bhakshi, Rama Rao, owed large debts to one Patmaraj Pandit (to whom the Jaghir lands were said to have been mortgaged as security) the Jaghir village was sold in the civil suit

D
(Abstract of
Sacrament).

and eventually purchased by Mr. H. Krishna Rao, Pensioned Regimentdar. When the Jaghir lands passed from the hands of Rama Rao to Mr. H. Krishna Rao, the management of the temple in the village and its affairs were vested by Government from the hands of Rama Rao (owing to complaints against him) and placed temporarily for a period of two years, in the hands of the Taluk Amildar. (Vide Government Order No. 4733-6 dated 28th March 1907).

Mr. H. Krishna Rao having petitioned to Government on 25th August 1908 that he had purchased Mahadevapur and the other Jaghir villages and paid up the mortgage amount to the creditor and requesting that the temple and its endowments be made over to him, Government in their Order No. 2240-2/Muz. 468-08 dated 3rd March 1911 directed on the recommendation made by Mr. A. Kantaraj Urs, the then Deputy Commissioner, that the temple with its endowments be at once made over to Mr. H. Krishna Rao, who was required to maintain proper accounts and forward monthly extracts to the Amildar, Serilingapatam Taluk, affording him at the same time every facility for inspection.

From this, it is clear that the management of the said Temple and its endowments remained in the hands of Mr. H. Krishna Rao. But from the applications received from Sirdar M. Lakshminikantara, Urs and Mr. Balaji Rao, son of the late Jaghirdar Rama Rao, it would appear that the Jaghir village of Mahadevapur was sold on 13th December 1915 to the late Maharajahakurari, as is evident from an extract of the sale deed annexed to the applications referred to in your letter under advertance, and it is on the strength of this, that

that Sirdar, who has obtained a General Power of Attorney (duly registered) from the 3rd Maharaja Kumari, now claims the management of the Temple and its endowments.

From the records it is seen that the ultimate controlling authority over the temple in question is Government, who made over the management thereof to Mr. H. Krishna Rao on taking sufficient guarantees from him (Vide Government Order quoted above).

I Government in their Notification No. 3086/Muz. 379-13-2 dated 2-5-1914 have already settled the question of the Scheme for management of the temple in question referred to in G.O. No. 125-6/MF.468-08-14 dated 13-7-1911, by the appointment of the Dharmadarsis for the general management of the affairs of the Institution.

As regards the 2nd para of your letter under reference, the Amildar, Seringapatam who was written to, on the subject, has in his Itticle No. 123 dated 10.2.1917 reported that the village of Hunsanhalli is in possession of Sirdar M. Lakshmikantaraj Urs and that 8 Vrithis in that village have been endowed to the Temple and that the income derived by the Temple from these lands is about Rs. 1087/- per year as stated in Yadi No. 102 addressed to the Amildar by the Sirdar on 8.2.1917

Now coming to the points in the petitions received from the Sirdar and Bala Rao, in this office with your letter under reference, I beg to state that

B. Sirdar Lakshmikantaraj Urs urges three points chiefly for consideration:-

(1) "That he is the owner of the village and there is a ^{usage} custom that the owner of the village should be the Manager of the Temple".

This point is disposed of by reference to the order of 1907 which states that there is no necessity why the owner of Yajman Vrithis should be the manager of the Temple.

(2) "That Mr. H. Krishna Rao when selling the village sold also the right to Manage the Temple".

It is doubtful whether Mr. Krishna Rao had any right to do so. For, the question of management of the temple is, I think, at the disposal of Government, being a Mazraa Institution.

(3) "That he would administer the temple very efficiently".

This is a point for consideration.

On the other side, the points urged by Balaji Rao are:-

(1) "Government in their Order of 1907 stated that the question of handing over the Temple to the Management of Balaji Rao would be considered at a later date".

Government did state so (Vide Copy of Order).

(2) "That the temple is more or less the family property of Rama Rao, (though a publicly endowed institution) and the management should, as far as possible, be in the family .

Balaji Rao or any one managing the temple would be accountable to Government, but if the temple was originally built by Balaji Rao's ancestors, as stated by him, he has, I think, a prior right to the management. That right has been recognised by Government. (See point 10.1).

(3) That he did not object when Mr. H. Krishna Rao was appointed manager, because he was a relative, and now that the village has gone to a stranger, he wishes to have the management in himself.

In itself the point has no weight.

Now, as between the Sirdar and Balaji Rao, the points for consideration are:-

- (1) Who will administer it better?
- & (2) Should Balaji Rao be given a chance?


As to the first point, the Sirdar states in his application dated *5th March 1917*, to the Deputy Commissioner that he would gladly administer the Temple affairs in an efficient manner and mentions several reasons why Balaji Rao would not do so.

As to the second point, it is a matter for consideration by Government with reference to their order of 1907.

The temple is now in a state of disrepair and has a desolate appearance.

In my opinion the Sirdar to whom the village belongs is much more likely to bring it into a good condition than Balaji Rao who has no further interest in the village. I would certainly hand over the management to the Sirdar.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,



Deputy Commissioner,
Mysore District.

A.J..

GEN. & REV. C.E.
23 AUG 1916

FILE No. 392
13/11/16
FILE No. 322-16
SERIAL N. 1

To

The Secretary,

to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja

of Mysore Muzrai Department,

Bangalore.

Petition of M. Balaji Rao son of M. Rama Rao, late
Jahagirdar of Mahadevapur residing in Bajjanna's Lines,
Chamaraja Puram, Mysore City.

Respected Sir,

79 3

With reference to Government Proceedings No.
2240-2/Muz. 468-08 dated the 3rd March 1911 transferring the
management of the affairs of the Sri Kasi Visvesvara Swami
Temple and its endowments in the Mahadevapur village to Mr.
H. Krishna Rao, Retired Regimentdar, as he had purchased the
Jahagir villages and appointing me as one of the Dharmadarsi
of the Institution, I beg to state that Mr. H. Krishna Rao
has since sold away the Mahadevapur and other villages which
he had purchased from me and my brothers, to the Maharaja
Kumari Princess 'Chaluvajammanniyavaru' and has now no
connection with the village or the Temple in question.
this connection, I respectfully beg to invite the kind at-
tention of Government to Government Proceedings No. R.1030-1/M
572-03-7 dated the 24th July 1905 and No. 4733-6-No. B.H.
28-3-07/2nd April 1907. It will be seen from these
Government Orders that the Temple and its endowments are
private personal properties of my ancestors and consequent

79 4

consequently of myself and that Government interference in the internal management thereof, was considered not proper.

In para 4 of the second of the Government Orders above referred to, Government have clearly indicated that after things are put in proper order the Government will consider whether the management of the temple may be transferred to Balaji Rao son of the late Jahagirdar."

The order of 3rd March 1911 above referred to was passed under exceptional circumstances. With a view to settle my large debts and to provide adequately for my future maintenance, I had sold the villages to Mr. H. Krishna Rao, a very near relation of mine. I acquired in the Government Order as the management of the temple was practically in my hands, Mr. H. Krishna Rao and Mr. Badami Krishna Rao, who were managing it being my very near relations and were doing every thing with my co-operation and approval. By the sale of the Jahagir villages to a third person the whole aspect of the matter has changed. As I stated before, the temple is a purely private temple. It is my private family temple and I have alone got the sole right to manage it. I was efficiently managing the affairs of the temple for 16 or 17 years before the order of Government above referred to, was passed.

again)

I enclose herewith copy of Judgment dated 21st Feb. 1911 in Regular appeal case No. 162 of 1909-10 on the file of the District Judge, Mysore Division, from which it will be seen that the above orders of Government were passed ultra vires and that I am legally entitled to succeed to the management of the Temple and its documents.

(3)

140

In these circumstances, I respectfully beg that the Government Order of 3rd March 1911 may be cancelled and the management of the Temple and its endowments transferred to me. As Utsavams have to be celebrated frequently I request the favour of very early orders in the matter.

I beg to remain,

Sir,

Y o u r m o s t o b e d i e n t s e r v a n t ,

M. Balaji Rao.

21st August 1916.

Mysore.

No 61. enc 1

REC. & REV. ST.
Vll
5 DEC 1916

11
CHALUVAMBA VILAS
MYSORE

4th. December 1916.

From

Sirdar M. Lakshikantraj Urs.
Chaluvamba Vilas.
Mysore.

934
1916/1917
mur
322-16
No. 2

To

The Secretary to the Government of H. H. The Maharaja of
Mysore.

General Department.

Bangalore.

Sir,

In acknowledging with thanks the certified copy of Government Proceedings No.2240-2, dated the 3rd.March 1911, relating to Sri Kasi Visveswara Swami Temple at Jahgir Mahadevpur village. Seringapatam Taluk, forwarded with your letter No.1720/Muzrai Dept., dated the 28th.November 1916, I have the honour to state that the Jahagir Mahadevpur and its other villages have since been purchased by the Third Maharaja-Kumari from Mr. H. Krishnarao, pensioned Regimentdar, who has executed a duly registered sale-deed on the 13th.December 1915.

In the sale-deed it is expressly stated by Mr. Krishnarao that the management of the temple of Sri Kasi Visveswara Swami with its endowments has been made over to the Third Maharaja-Kumari (Cheluvajammanni avaru). An extract from the said Registered sale-deed is herewith forwarded for favour of information.

Mr. H. Krishnarao in his letter dated 20th.October 1916 states that he has in anticipation of Government sanction, handed over the management of the temple in question with its endowments. The old accounts are being verified by him and it


17
is expected that they would be handed over to the purchaser
ere long.

As I have obtained a general Power of Attorney duly register-
-ed from the Third Maharaja-Kumari, for the management of the
Jahagir villages etc, and as the Government order No.2240-2
dated 3rd. March 1911 has not been modified, I request that you
will be so good as to obtain the orders of Government to the
effect that the management of the said temple and its endow-
-ments be made over to me.

I have the honour to be

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

Mad. A. B. Chintamani


18

ವರ್ಷ 1916ನೇ ಇಸ್ವಿ ಬಸವಂತರಾಜು 11ರಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ವೀಕರಿಸಿ
ತೀರ್ಮಾನವಾಗಿ ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಆದಾಯ ವಲಸೆ 1915-16ನೇ ಸಾಲಿಗೆ
Iನೇಯಕ್ಕೆ 8ನೇ ವಾಲ್ಯೂ 127ರೂಪಾಯಿ 140ನೇ ಸೇರಿಸಿ
ಸಳವು S.No.21 ಆಗಿರುವ ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಆದಾಯದ ಎಚ್ ಸ್ಟ್ಯಾಂಪ್
ಶೀಟ್ — 1915ನೇ ಇಸ್ವಿ ತೀರ್ಮಾನವು 13ರಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ವೀಕರಿಸಿ
ಎವಳ್ಳು ಸರ್. 3ನೇಯದ ರಾಜ್ಯ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಆದಾಯದ ಎವಳ್ಳು
ಮಂಡಲದ ಆದಾಯದ ಎವಳ್ಳು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಎವಳ್ಳು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಎವಳ್ಳು
ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಎವಳ್ಳು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಎವಳ್ಳು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಎವಳ್ಳು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಎವಳ್ಳು

“ “ “ “ “

ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಇರಾಕಕ್ಕೆ ವಶಪಡಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವ ಕೆಲಸವನ್ನು ಈಗಲೂ
ಕಡಿಗಿಡುಗಡೆಗೆ.

“ “ “ “ “

ಮಹಾ ಮೇಲಾಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಎವಳ್ಳು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಎವಳ್ಳು
ಮಕ್ಕಳ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಎವಳ್ಳು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಎವಳ್ಳು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಎವಳ್ಳು
ಮಕ್ಕಳ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಎವಳ್ಳು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಎವಳ್ಳು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಎವಳ್ಳು

“ “ “ “ “

ಈಗಲೂ ಎಚ್. ಸ್ಟ್ಯಾಂಪ್‌ಗಳನ್ನು ಸ್ವೀಕರಿಸಿ.

ಈಗಲೂ ಸ್ವೀಕರಿಸುವ ಕೆಲಸವನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಎವಳ್ಳು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಎವಳ್ಳು
ಶೀ. ಬಾಂಬಾಯ್ — } ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಎವಳ್ಳು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಎವಳ್ಳು
ಶೀ. ಮಹಾರಾಷ್ಟ್ರ — } ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಎವಳ್ಳು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಎವಳ್ಳು
ಶೀ. ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಎವಳ್ಳು — } ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಎವಳ್ಳು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಎವಳ್ಳು

ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಎವಳ್ಳು
ಬಾಂಬಾಯ್ —

२९ द्वा. सं.

29 ఆంధ్ర శంకరాచార్య శ్రీ సత్యనారాయణ శాస్త్రి
శ్రీ బాధామృత శ్రీరామాయణం.

#. ಸಂಸಾರವೇ ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮಣನು

ಎಣ್ಣೆ ಬಿ ಕೊಡು. - ಅಂತಿ

True copy

True copy La Shunk antargia

SUBJECT.....

Diary No. of letter replied to.....1323

General and Revenue Secretariat

()
, the 192 .

Date of issue.....18-2-22

Signed by.....M.T.E. J. J. J.

May this be

- i Printed ?
- ii treated as a standing order ?
- iii published in the Gazette,
English Part ?
- iv translated ?
- v placed at the disposal of the press ?
- vi published in the Gazette,
Kannada Part ?

Section

File No. 269
Serial No. 1922
2 -

Proceedings of the Government of
His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

Read—

Applications read no
392 and 934 of 21st August
and 4th Decr., 1916 from
Mr. M. Balaji Rao v.
Sundar. M. K. S. S. S. S. S.
Raj Urs, Mysore, praying
for the restoration of the
management of Sri Kati
Vishweswara Srami Temple
Order Thereon No.
and a endowment in Maha-
Sanghara Sagar Village in
The Selangapattana Taluk.

Memo No. C. 812 of
2 Decr. 1922

From the Muzrai Commr
forwarding with his opinion
the Dy Commr Communication
No. 553 of 29th Nov 1922
on the subject

Thereon No. 2239-41 Decr
269-22-2 with
of 10.2.22.

Sri Kari Vidwasanra Svarni
Temple in Mahatrapura Jagui
Village, Serungapatam Taluk
is a Hindu temple endowed with
8 Vithas in the village yielding
an annual income of Rs 1087/-.
The Sri Mahanaga-kumari
purchased in Decr 1915 from
Mr H. Krishna Rao, the
Jagui Mahatrapura and its
other villages and since
Mr. K. R. Shankara Raju
who holds a General Power
from the Hindu Mahanaga-kumari
requests that the management

List of enclosures.

of the temple in question
and its endowments be inducted
and order to be made that the
management of the temple and its
endowments may be continued

Copied by

Examined by

File

GENERAL AND REVENUE
SECRETARIAT.

(Continuation sheet draft form.)

Mr. Mr. Balaji Rao Sani
The late Jaghirdar Mr. Mr.
Rama Rao contended that
the temple and its endowments
are the private properties
of his ancestors and
prays that the management
may be ^{left in his hands} ~~entrusted to him~~.

The Dy. Commr. to whom
the petitions were referred,
is of opinion ^{with regard to them} ~~that~~ that Sardar
Mr. Dattashankar Rao
to whom the jagir village
now belongs, is much more
likely to bring the instn.
into a good condition than
Mr. Balaji Rao who has no
further interest in the
village, and recommends that
the management may be
handed over to the Sardar.
The Muz. Commr. concurs
in the view ^{expressed} ~~expressed~~ by
the Dy. Commr.

Under the circumstances
reported Govt are pleased
to sanction the Dy. Commr.
recommendation concerned
by the Muz. Commr. in Mysore.

A regular scale of
income and exp^{ts} ^{should} be drawn
up before the management
is handed over to the Muz. Commr. } For appl. ✓

It is reported that
the temple is now in a state
of disrepair and presents a
desolate appearance.
The Muz. Commr. is requested
to take such further action
as ~~may~~ ^{is} necessary for the
renovation and proper
maintenance of the temple
in future

File
81-1-23

22/1/23
29/1/23
20/1/23

The Muz. Commr. in the presence of
2.0. Amphibian 2/1/23
" 1/1/23